REMARKS

Claims 19, 21-32, 34, 35, and 37 are pending in the present application. Claims 20, 33, and 36 have been canceled. Claims 19, 32, and 35 have been amended. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example at page 8, lines 5-25 and page 11, lines 22-29. Claims 19, 32, and 35 are the independent claims.

Examiner Interview

Applicant appreciates Examiner Bilgrami's time and attention to a telephonic interview on May 23, 2008, with Applicant's undersigned representative, during which proposed claim amendments were discussed in light of the disclosure of U.S. Patent Number 6,801,949 to Bruck et al. ("Bruck"), U.S. Patent Number 6,154,765 to Hart ("Hart"), and U.S. Patent Number 5,774,660 to Brendel et al. ("Brendel").

Claim rejections

Claims 19, 22, 23, 25-32, 34, 35, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 6,801,949 to Bruck *et al.* ("Bruck") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,154,765 to Hart ("Hart"). Claims 20, 21, 24, 33, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Bruck in view of Hart, in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,774,660 to Brendel *et al.* ("Brendel").

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited references because the cited references do not teach or suggest caching a response from a server such that the cache contains a mapping between the network address of the server and ***a combination of a Virtual Interface Architecture (VIA) cluster name and a VIA server name***, as claimed. Furthermore the cited references do not teach or suggest sending a ***Server Resolution Protocol*** request or receiving a ***Server Resolution Protocol*** response, as claimed. Finally, the cited references fail to teach or suggest ***detecting a failure of a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection*** with a server, as claimed.

The Office Action acknowledges that Bruck and Hart do not disclose caching a response from the server in a cache (Office Action dated 4/02/2008 – p. 6). Applicant respectfully submits that Brendel does not teach the claimed caching either.

Brendel does not teach or suggest caching a response such that the cache contains a mapping between the network address of the server and ***a combination of the VIA cluster name and VIA server name***, as recited in the independent claims. The specification describes a Virtual Interface Architecture routing protocol that recognizes cluster names and machine names. In accordance with the VIA protocol, the cluster name in combination with the server name may be mapped to a physical network endpoint associated with the server (Specification p. 8, ll. 13-20).

In contrast, Brendel discloses a web traffic load balancing system where an Internet Protocol (IP) address is cached by in a computer's browser software (Brendel, c. 4, ll. 5-10), not a mapping between the network address of the server and ***a combination of the VIA cluster name and VIA server name***, as claimed. An IP address is a numerical routing address and not a combination of a VIA cluster name and a VIA server name. This distinction is consistent with the general approach shown in Brendel, in which use of IP protocol enables Brendel's load balancing system; Brendel's system does not use Virtual Interface Architecture protocol at all.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest caching a response from a server such that the cache contains a mapping between the network address of the server and ***a combination of a Virtual Interface Architecture (VIA) cluster name and a VIA server name***, as claimed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentable define over the cited references.

Furthermore, the cited references do not teach or suggest sending a ***Server Resolution Protocol request*** or receiving a ***Server Resolution Protocol response***, as recited in the independent claims. Brendel uses IP addresses and a Domain Name Server (DNS) when providing web traffic load balancing (Brendel, c. 4, ll. 5-10). Brendel does not disclose using Server Resolution Protocol in any context. Bruck teaches handling server failures with a load balancer that reassigns virtual IP addresses (Bruck, c. 6 l. 45 – c. 7 l. 2). Bruck does not disclose a Server Resolution Protocol in any context. Hart describes a distributed digital

processor for creating a single system image for a cluster of processors. Hart does not disclose Server Resolution Protocol in any context.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest sending a ***Server Resolution Protocol request*** or receiving a ***Server Resolution Protocol response***, as claimed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentable define over the cited references.

Finally, the cited references do not teach or suggest ***detecting a failure of a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection*** with a server, as recited in the independent claims. The Office Action recognizes that Bruck does not disclose a connection over a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol (Office Action dated 04/02/2008 – p. 3). The Office Action does not allege that Brendel teaches this feature. Instead, the Office Action relies on Hart for teaching a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection. However, Hart does not disclose ***detecting a failure of a first Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection***, as now claimed. Rather, Hart discloses that Virtual Interface Architecture would reduce overhead associated with a back up process (Hart, c. 8, ll. 10-33). Hart recognizes that the Virtual Interface Architecture provides low latency and high bandwidth interconnections; however, Hart is not ***detecting a failure of a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection***.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest ***detecting a failure of a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection*** with a server, as claimed. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentable define over the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest caching a response from a server such that the cache contains a mapping between the network address of the server and ***a combination of a Virtual Interface Architecture (VIA) cluster name and a VIA server name***, as claimed. Furthermore the cited references do not teach or suggest sending a ***Server Resolution Protocol*** request or receiving a ***Server Resolution Protocol*** response, as claimed. Finally, the cited references fail to teach or suggest ***detecting a failure of a Virtual Interface Architecture protocol connection*** with a server, as claimed.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, and a Notice of Allowance for claims 19, 21-32, 34, 35, and 37.

Date: July 2, 2008

/Michael A. Koptiw/
Michael A. Koptiw
Registration No. 57,900

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439